

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The Office Action of August 28, 2002 has been received and carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-35 are currently pending and claim 13 has been amended.

The Examiner made a requirement for a new title. Applicant submits herewith a new title.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-35 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Related Art Figures 1 & 2 (ARAF) in view of Toshio et al. (JP 2-210402). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is allowable at least for the reason that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including forming a black matrix on a substrate, the black matrix having an identification mark and an alignment key.

Claim 13 is allowable at least for the reason that claim 13 recites a combination of elements including an identification mark corresponding to the pattern at a periphery of the substrate.

Claim 16 is allowable at least for the reason that claim 16 recites a combination of elements including forming a black matrix on a first substrate, the black matrix having an identification mark at a periphery of the first substrate.

Claim 27 is allowable at least for the reason that claim 27 recites a combination of elements including a black matrix on the first substrate, the black matrix having a pattern and an identification mark at a periphery of the first substrate.

None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claims.

On pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that ARAF do not disclose an identification mark. The Examiner cites Toshio et al. in an attempt to cure the deficiencies of ARAF. Toshio et al. may teach a color filter with an identification mark, but the reference does not teach “the black matrix” and the “identification mark” as recited by claims 1, 13, 16, and 27. Toshio et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of ARAF.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 13, 16, and 27 are allowable, as the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and requests that the rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Moreover, claims 2-12, 14, 15, 17-26, and 28-35 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on claims 1, 13, 16, and 27, which are believed to be allowable.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned “Version with markings to show changes made.”

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

Dated: November 27, 2002

Respectfully submitted,

By Teresa M Arroyo  
Teresa M. Arroyo  
Registration No.: 50,015  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant



30827  
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

DC:111576.1

**Version With Markings to Show Changes Made**

**In the Title**

Please delete the Title in favor of the following amended Title:

--COLOR FILTER SUBSTRATE HAVING IDENTIFICATION MARK FORMED IN THE  
BLACK MATRIX--

**In the Claims**

Please amend the claims as follows:

13. (Amended) A color filter substrate for use in a liquid crystal display device comprising:
  - a substrate;
  - a black matrix having a pattern on the substrate;
  - red, green and blue color filters corresponding to the pattern; and
  - an identification mark corresponding to the pattern at a periphery of the substrate.